



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik. Erster Jahrgang.
Heft 2.

Attention has already been called, in a previous number of the Journal, to this new undertaking. The second part confirms fully the belief there expressed in the value of the work for all Latin scholars. The first article, "Zu den lateinischen Kausalpartikeln," by the editor, Professor Wölflin, contains many interesting facts in regard to the use of *ob* and *propter* and other words denoting cause. *Ob* is found in Tacitus 166 times, *propter* (aside from Dial. 21) occurs in the historical works but once (Hist. 1, 65), and *propterea* not at all. So, too, Ammianus Marcellinus, an imitator, though not a very skilful one, of Tacitus, uses *propter* but once, and that in *qua propter*, while of *ob* there are some 80 instances. Florus uses *propter* but once, *ob* 12 times, both with substantives and demonstrative pronouns. In Sulpicius Severus, Chron. 2, 30, 8, *propter* occurs, following the Vulgate, elsewhere *ob* is used, but in his other writings the reverse relation obtains, *ob* being used but 6 times, and *propter* 12 times, so that *ob* seems especially to mark the historical style. So Julius Valerius does not use *propter*, but has *ob* 6 times. Dares has 6 cases of *ob*, and only once *qua propter*. It seems hardly probable that Tacitus should have been the first to show this decided preference for *ob*. The same tendency appears in Pomponius, Mela and Velleius. In the inscriptions of the republican period, causal *propter* occurs but once, in the phrase *propterea quod*, while *ob* is found 24 times. Something may be due to the endeavor to avoid collision between causal and local *propter*, for of *propter*, with local force, Tacitus makes frequent use, often putting it after its noun. Curtius avoids both *propter* and *ob* in local relations, while Cicero uses *propter* in both senses. On the other hand, some writers sedulously avoid the use of *ob* in causal sense, e. g. Cornificius has only once *quas ob res* (for the classical *quam ob rem*), but frequently *propter*. Caesar uses *ob eam rem*, *ob eas res*, *ob eam causam*, but, aside from such formal phrases, he distinctly prefers *propter*. Palladius has *propter* 25 times, *ob* not at all. Juvenal has *propter* 18 times, *ob* but once. *Propter* occurs in the Vulgate between 600 and 700 times; *ob*, exclusive of formal phrases like *quam ob rem*, only 20 times.

Among the writers using freely both *propter* and *ob* is Plautus, who, however, in speaking of persons usually employs *propter* (never, e. g., *ob me*), *ob filiam*, Epid. 701, being an exception, while *ob praereptam mulierem* may be explained as equalling *ob praereptionem mulieris*. *Ob id*, which is just beginning to appear in Plautus alongside of *ob eam rem*, attains a wider use in Livy and Tacitus, and especially in Pliny the elder. Seneca and Suetonius prefer *ob hoc* to *ob id*, while Cicero and Caesar avoid both *ob ea* and *ob id*. *Quas ob res*, *quas ob causas*, like the Greek διὰ ταῦτα, occur in vulgar style, often where but one reason is

mentioned. On the other hand, Terence says *multae sunt causae quam ob rem cupio*, which shows clearly that *quam ob rem* was already felt as a compound. The use of *ob* with a substantive and passive participle, of which Cato furnishes us an early example in the phrase *ob rem gestam*, is especially cultivated by Livy. Thereby the coining of new verbals in *-io* is avoided. Draeger's statement (II² 852) in regard to the use of *ob* with the gerundive needs correcting. The construction is archaic, hence Gellius, 3, 3, 14, has *ob quaerendum victum*. *Propter* is not substituted in such phrases until the silver age. Some interesting facts are given in regard to the use of *gratia* and *causa* with the genitive, *causa* here being the older. This is very clearly seen in Cornificius, who uses *causa* thus 40 times, *gratia* not even once. Caesar uses *causa* 150 times, and *gratia* but twice. Cicero, for the sake of variety, uses *gratia*, but *causa* much more frequently. Nevertheless, *gratia*, in early poets, is by no means rare. In Plautus it often retains a shade of its original force, like the Greek *χάρις*, hence the frequent combinations, *mea, tua, nostra, senis gratia*. While we find both *honoris gratia* and *honoris causa*, *amoris gratia* and *amoris causa*, in the phrase *animi causa*, *gratia* never takes the place of *causa*. Tertullian attempted to draw distinctions between *gratia* and *causa*, confining *causa*, for the most part, to personal relations. He uses *mei causa*, and it is worthy of remark that Plautus, Most. 580, has already *causa tui*. *Gratia* with the genitive of a *gerund* followed by the accusative is rare and archaic. *Merito, beneficio* and *ergo* are briefly discussed, while the consideration of the use of *quia, quod, quoniam* is deferred as a special theme by itself.

In a note on p. 176, Carl Weyman shows that *modulabilis* occurs in Paulinus Nolanus, Carm. 27, 79. In a notice of the first number of the Archiv we have shown that it occurs also in the Scholia Bernensia. It cannot, therefore, be excluded from the Lexica.

The next article, pp. 177-94, by H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, is a thorough treatment of the Latin suffix *-anus*, which, we are told, is a specimen of the dictionary of Latin suffixes now in preparation. *Anus*, it is claimed, is a secondary suffix, developed on Latin soil; *-nus* being added originally to stems of the first declension, and afterwards the ending *-ānus* was abstracted and applied to stems of other declensions, very much as *incapabilis* is formed after the analogy of *amabilis*. So in Latin, although Plautus has already *urbanus*, we must start from adjectives like *Albanus*. The formation of such adjectives from names of persons (like *Cleopatra-nus*) is not as common, and seems rather to have been avoided in the classical period. Adjectives from appellatives like *octavianus, decimanus, Aurelianus* are formed from feminine adjectives with the ellipsis of nouns like *legio, pars, tribus*, etc. Most cognomina of victorious generals were formed in *-icus*, as *Asiaticus, Creticus*, but for **Africicus* there was no analogy, and, as it would have become **Africus*, it became necessary to coin *Africanus*. A long list of adjectives in *-anus* from proper names in *-us* and *-ius*, and from common nouns in *-us* and *-um*, is given. Less numerous, naturally, are the cases where *-anus* is added to third-declension stems. None are formed from stems of the 4th declension, and very few from stems of the 5th, as *meridianus*. *Levana, Praestana, Tutanus* and *Voranus* receive a special treatment. *Praestana* is referred back to an original **Praestitana*; *Levana, Tutana* and *Vorana* to the hypothetical forms **levus, *tutus, *vorus*, which have the force of present participles, cf. *carnivorus*.

The ending *-ianus* is due to a false separation of stem and suffix. *Caesarianus* was possible neither for Cicero nor Caesar. Nor would Cicero have used *Ciceronianus*, but *Caesarianus* occurs in Hirtius, bell. Alex. 59, along with *Pompeianus*, which may have had some influence. The authors of the bel. Afric. and bel. Hispan. use it however, as does Nepos. Even Cicero, in Ad. Att. 16, II. 8, allows *Lepidianus* to slip from his pen, and after him the distinction between *-anus* and *-ianus* ceased to be sharply felt. This is shown in such formations as *Crassianus*, *Catullianus*. In fact *-ianus* increases even at the expense of *-anus*. Adjectives which must have taken their rise in the vulgar idiom, as *Aquilonianus*, *castrensianus*, have apparently the same meanings as their primitives, while *Germanicianus* and *Britannicianus* take on a different sense. The same ending, applied to adjectives, may be witnessed in the Romance languages, cf. *mezzano*, *certano*, *tardano*, *provano*. From Greek words in *ίτης*, Latinized adjectives are formed in great numbers, like *Abderitanus*. Hence, a suffix *-itanus* was abstracted, and, by false analogy, adjectives formed like *Salernitanus*, *transtigritanus*. The article closes with an attempt to define the province of the suffix.

In a note, Havet defends the forms *puellarius* and *puerarius* on evidence taken from glossaries and from Petronius, c. 43, and assigns to *patella*, in the passage cited by Nonius from Varro's Eumenides:

Patella esurienti posita provocat Neapolitanas piscinas,

the meaning of shell fish = Fr. *patelle*.

Stowasser, pp. 195-203, goes carefully over the evidence as to the genitive sing. of *a*-stems in Lucilius, and comes to these conclusions: There are 21 certain cases of the genitive in *ae*. For a diphthongal pronunciation of *ai* there is no warrant. It rests wholly upon Müller's erroneous interpretation of the grammarians. In iambics and trochaics, the forms in *āi* are entirely avoided, and there are not, altogether, more than 3 or 4 cases of *āi*, two of which are at the end of a verse. This result agrees with Engelbrecht's observation that Plautus used the forms in *ai*, while Terence regarded them as antiquated. Lucretius used them for metrical reasons or to give archaic coloring.

For *sanitas valetudo*, in Augustin. civ. D. I², p. 29, 28 (Domb.), Hoffmann would read *sanevaletudo* and enrich our Lexica with this new word. G. Gröber discusses, in the next paper (pp. 204-54), a very fascinating theme, "Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Worte." The problem is given us to find, by a comparison of the Romance languages, the vulgar Latin forms from which the Romance words are derived. Here a careful distinction must be made between words which have come into the Romance languages by direct inheritance (*Erbwörter*), and those borrowed from the Latin at a later period of literary cultivation. The vulgar Latin itself is not sufficiently well known to us through its monuments, and the *Erbwörter* even in their earliest form, as we find them in writings of the 9th century, are often much changed from the original vulgar Latin form, so that this has to be established by a process of comparison. Such a comparison Diez had already begun, but a systematic attempt to arrive at the vulgar Latin form of all Romance words has not yet been made. The investigation must go hand in hand with studies in the

Latin itself. The various Romance dialects protect us, to a certain extent, against erroneous inferences. And here it is of great importance to determine approximately the date of the splitting up of the vulgar Latin into dialects. After the reduction of Italy and Sicily, Roman conquest took a western course, embracing Sardinia, Corsica, Spain, then turned to the northwest (Gaul), and finally to the northeast (Raetia and Dacia); certain phonetic phenomena seem to run parallel to this course of conquest, from west to east. Sardinia has the most archaisms, *e. g.*, *h* before *e* and *i*, accented *i* and *u*, final *s* and *t*, in declension and conjugation, etc. Moreover, the West Romance languages favor the consonantal close, the East Romance the vowel close. Some consonant groups, like *ct*, *cs*, *cl*, experience an entirely different treatment in the east and west. The most completely developed and furthest removed from the Latin is the vulgar idiom of Italy itself. Less developed is the Romansch and Raetoromance, and still less the dialects of Gaul and Spain, and nearest to the archaic and written Latin is the Sardinian.

The following data are useful for determining the chronology. The agreement of (a) Sard., (b) Span., (c) Port., (d) Catal., (e) Prov., (f) French, (g) Raetorom., (h) Romansch, minus (i) Ital., proves the existence of a form until after 100 A. D. The agreement of *abcdef* minus *ghi* proves its existence until after the Gallic conquest. An agreement between Spanish and Sardinian vouches for the existence of a form only down to 200 B. C. Where Italian and Latin agree, there was no difference between the literary and the vulgar form. This comparison is like the comparison of MSS of a different age, and the results reached are still more certain. *E. g.* the absence of final *m* in all the Romance languages, of *h* initial and interior, the loss of *n* before *s*, found in Sardinia (*isposo* = *sponsum*), of *v* in the perfect, point to the disappearance of these sounds before 240 B. C., a result confirmed by inscriptions. The existence of *au* in several of the Romance languages does not favor the supposition that *au* was ordinarily pronounced *o*, although *o* may have served as an inexact expression of the sound. Prothetic *i*, as in Sard. *isposo*, must have found its way very early into the vulgar speech. Gröber lays down the following propositions. I. Where Romance = vulgar Latin = Latin. (1) In vulgar Latin of every period, Lat. *ā*, *ē*, *ī*, *ō*, *ū*, *ǣ*, *ē*, *ö*, before one or more consonants, had the same sound as in the literary language. (2) *au* continued to exist in vulgar Latin. (3) The Ital. *l r, m n, s f v, p b, t d, q c g* before *a o u*, correspond to the same sounds in Latin. Hence the sounds were the same in vulgar Latin. (4) Gemination in Italian, corresponding to gemination of consonants in Lat., proves that both consonants were heard in vulgar Latin. The French confirms this by its different treatment of *tel* from *talem*, and *val* from *vallem*, *main* from *manum*, *an* from *annum*, etc. (5) The existence of a guttural sound in *x* can be traced through the Romance languages back to the first century after Christ, and the oldest evidence for *cs* = *s* is found in an inscription of the second century. (6) The *j* (= Eng. *y*) found in Sard., Sicil., Neap., proves this sound for vulgar Latin. Sibilantion did not take place till late under the empire.

II. Where the Romance = vulgar Latin, but differs from Latin, in the following respects. (1) The loss of *h*, of final *m*, of *n* before *s*. (2) the use of forms with prothetic *s*. (3) the change of *ae* to *ē* and of *oe* to *ē*. (3) the coalescence of accented vowels with following *i* or *u* to diphthongs. (4) the

change to *j* of *i* or *e* in unaccented endings, or before a vowel bearing the accent (*faciamus*). In the Romance languages, either assimilation to preceding consonant or some palatal sound results, cf. Sard. *fizu* = *filium*, It. *faciamo* = *faciamus*, *debba* = *debeat*, etc. (6) The lengthening of short accented vowels before single consonants, although this admits of a different explanation. (7) The omission of *u*, *i*, *e* in the penultimate of proparoxytones, as shown in the *poplum*, *tabeis*, etc., of inscriptions, so *soldus*, *caldus*, etc. (8) The shifting of the accent from the antepenult to penult and vice versa in special cases, e. g. Sard. *lentôlu* = Lat. *linteolum*, Sard. *intréu*, Span. *entéro* = Lat. *integrum*. (9) In the case of *ch*, *ph*, *th*, only the mute obtains recognition in the vulgar Latin and Romance, cf. Ital. *braccio*, Span. *brazo*. (10) Changes in the guttural series cannot be brought under rules. Loss of medial *g*, as in Sard. *vinti*, Fr. *vingt*, can only be proved for Romance, and how far the sound of *c*, *g* before *e* and *i* varied from that before *a*, *o* and *u* cannot be proved, as the Sardinian preserves the hard sound, while elsewhere *c*, *g* before *e*, *i* pass into sibilants. In word-formation (11) *-arius* replaced by *-erius*, *-ulus* by *-culus*, *itus*, *-tus*, *-sus* by *-utus*, cf. It. *tenuto* for *tentus*, not found in Sardinian. (12) The preference for the inchoative formation in certain Romance dialects and in vulgar Latin. (13) The strengthening of the demonstrative pronoun by *ecce* and *eccum*. (14) The coincidence in form, in the Romance languages, of the imperfect indicative of verbs of the 2-4 conjugation. This would seem to prove the existence, in early Latin, of a class of imperfects like **florē-am* from *floro*, **finiām* from *finio* (cf. *eram*), while in the first conjugation, as *amās* would have been contracted into *amās*, the form in *-bam* held its own, and in the literary language prevailed also in the other conjugations.

The article closes with an alphabetical list (*abbreviare—būtis*) of vulgar Latin words deduced from the Romance languages. This list contains much that is suggestive, and is to be continued.

Under the title "Kirchengeschichtliche Anekdota und ihr sprachlicher Wert," pp. 255-66, Phil. Weber discusses many peculiarities of ecclesiastical Latin. We may notice the form *illum* as neuter, *veteras*, *frigores* after the analogy of *calores*, the superlative *scelerentissimus* to be compared with *pientissimus*, found in inscriptions.

Fr. Vogel, who is about to make a new edition of Ennodius, points out some of the features of that author's style (Ennodiana, pp. 267-71), and shows how he was unable to fully emancipate himself from the faults of his time. *Accidere* and *accedere* have become one word and both make the perfect *accessi*, *subripui* acts as perfect of *subripere* and *subrepere*, *onus* is confused with *honorem*. Some 21 new words are given.

The rest of the number is given up to Miscellen, and closes with an appreciative notice of the lamented Gustav Löwe, by his colleague, Ivo Bruns.

M. WARREN.

Observations sur Thucydide I xi. Par M. W. HUMPHREYS (Mélanges Graux).

Prof. M. W. Humphreys has contributed to the *Mélanges Graux* an article in which he undertakes to demonstrate that in Thuc. I 11, l. 4, we should read *ἐκράτῃσαν* for *ἐκράτῃσαν*, which the editions exhibit. The suggestion was made long ago by Thiersch. No exception can be taken to the statement